



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.								
10/565,499	01/23/2006	Zheng Lu	LCS-105/PCT/US	9918								
7590 Steven C. Bauman Henkel Corporation 1001 Trout Brook Crossing Rocky Hill, CT 06067		01/02/2008	<table border="1"><tr><td colspan="2">EXAMINER</td></tr><tr><td colspan="2">LOEWE, ROBERT S</td></tr><tr><td>ART UNIT</td><td>PAPER NUMBER</td></tr><tr><td>1796</td><td></td></tr></table>		EXAMINER		LOEWE, ROBERT S		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	1796	
EXAMINER												
LOEWE, ROBERT S												
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER											
1796												
			<table border="1"><tr><td>MAIL DATE</td><td>DELIVERY MODE</td></tr><tr><td>01/02/2008</td><td>PAPER</td></tr></table>		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	01/02/2008	PAPER				
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE											
01/02/2008	PAPER											

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/565,499	Applicant(s) LU ET AL.	
	Examiner Robert Loewe	Art Unit 1796	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 January 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>1/23/06</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 1796

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

Claim 8 is objected to because of the following informalities: "cyclotetrasiloxane" is a known synonym for octamethylcyclotetrasiloxane and should be removed from claim 8 since "octamethylcyclotetrasiloxane" is already claimed. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the claim limitation "amino-functional silazane" is confusing. A silazane, by its very definition comprises an amino group. It is therefore unclear if Applicant's are referring to a silazane, such as hexamethyldisilazane, or a silazane, which further comprises another amino group present. For purposes of further examination, the phrase "amino-functional silazane" will be taken as polysilazane or cyclic trisilazane as provided in Applicant's specification. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 1796

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-11, 14-16, and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobayashi et al. (US Pat. 5,880,227).

It is first noted that the applied reference teaches some of the claimed non-VOC carriers (5:40-41). However, Kobayashi et al. refers to these components as volatile silicones. However, because the claimed non-VOC siloxanes and the volatile silicones as taught by Kobayashi et al. can be the same, Kobayashi et al., when referring to volatile silicones, also refers to non-VOC carriers as claimed.

Claim 1: Kobayashi et al. teaches a curable composition comprising a curable component which is comprised of a polyfunctional siloxane and at least one crosslinker (abstract). Kobayashi et al. further teaches that the curable composition can be used for mold-release applications (5:63). It therefore follows that Kobayashi et al. teaches "a curable mold release

Art Unit: 1796

composition" as stated in the claim preamble. While Kobayashi et al. is silent with regards to mold release performance, specifically, as that the composition(s) are able to promote at least five mold releases without transfer of mold release composition to a part, Kobayashi et al. does teach the chemical composition of instant claim 1. The courts have stated that a chemical composition and its properties are inseparable. Therefore, if the prior art teaches the identical chemical structure, the properties applicant discloses and/or claims are necessarily present. *In re Spada*, 911 F.2d 705, 15 USPQ2d 1655, (Fed. Cir. 1990). See also *In re Best*, 562 F.2d 1252, 195 USPQ 430, (CCPA 1977). "Where the claimed and prior art products are identical or substantially identical in structure or composition, or are produced by identical or substantially identical processes, a prima facie case of either anticipation or obviousness has been established." Further, if it is the applicant's position that this would not be the case: (1) evidence would need to be provided to support the applicant's position; and (2) it would be the Office's position that the application contains inadequate disclosure that there is no teaching as to how to obtain the claimed properties with only the claimed ingredients.

Claim 2: Kobayashi et al. teaches that mixed solvent systems/carriers may be used (examples section). Kobayashi et al. further teaches that the solvents may be volatile

Claim 3: Kobayashi et al. teaches a moisture-curable composition (abstract).

Claims 4 and 5: While Kobayashi et al. is silent with regards to gloss values of the composition, Kobayashi et al. does teach the chemical composition of instant claim 1. The courts have stated that a chemical composition and its properties are inseparable. Therefore, if the prior art teaches the identical chemical structure, the properties applicant discloses and/or

Art Unit: 1796

claims are necessarily present. *In re Spada*, 911 F.2d 705, 15 USPQ2d 1655, (Fed. Cir. 1990). See also *In re Best*, 562 F.2d 1252, 195 USPQ 430, (CCPA 1977). “Where the claimed and prior art products are identical or substantially identical in structure or composition, or are produced by identical or substantially identical processes, a prima facie case of either anticipation or obviousness has been established.” If it is the applicant's position that this would not be the case: (1) evidence would need to be provided to support the applicant's position; and (2) it would be the Office's position that the application contains inadequate disclosure that there is no teaching as to how to obtain the claimed properties with only the claimed ingredients.

Claims 6-8: Kobayashi et al. further teaches that the non-VOC carrier/diluent/solvent can be hexamethyldisiloxane and octamethylcyclotetrasiloxane (5:40-41).

Claims 9 and 10: Kobayashi et al. further teaches that the non-VOC carrier/diluent/solvent can be employed from 5 to 90% by weight (5:47-50), which fully encompasses the range of instant claim 9, and partially encompasses the range of instant claim 10.

Claim 11: Kobayashi et al. further teaches that the non-VOC carrier/diluent/solvent does not react with the curable component (5:24-42).

Claim 14: Kobayashi et al. further teaches that the crosslinker may be, among others, an alkoxy-functional silane (4:52-5:23).

Claim 15: Because Kobayashi et al. teaches some of the same non-VOC carrier/diluent/solvent as the instant application, it inherently follows that Kobayashi et al.

Art Unit: 1796

teaches that the composition of instant claim 1 has a room temperature solvent evaporation range falling in the range of instant claim 15.

Claim 16: While Kobayashi et al. teaches that the compositions were cured at room temperature over the course of 1 week (examples 1, 2, 3, and 4), the curing time is a result-effective variable. The courts have stated that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art (i.e., does not require undue experimentation). *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233.

“Discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art.” *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980). Note too MPEP 2144.05 which states that “differences in concentration or temperature will not support the patentability of subject matter encompassed by the prior art unless there is evidence indicating such concentration or temperature is critical”. In the instant case, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to reduce the curing times as taught by Kobayashi et al. and would have been motivated to do so because shorter cure times allow for a more efficient process and more economic benefit. Further, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have been able to reduce the cure times by performing any one, or a combination of, the following: screening different curing catalyst, increasing the amount of curing catalyst, and/or increase the water content. Last, it is obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art, that although Kobayashi et al. teaches cure times of 1 week, the curing mechanism(s) would occur immediately upon moisture exposure, and thus, even after a few minutes or hours, substantial curing would take place. The claim as currently written does not call for a “full” cure of the system. However, even if written as such, the reasons given above would not demonstrate

Art Unit: 1796

novelty or unobviousness, when applied to the teachings of Kobayashi et al. Applicants further define the term "cure" as covering both partial and complete curing in the instant specification.

Claims 18 and 19: Kobayashi et al. teaches the presence of a moisture cure-accelerating catalyst (4:30-51).

Claim 20: Kobayashi et al. teaches that the compositions may be cured at room temperature (5:53-56).

Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobayashi et al. (US Pat. 5,880,227) in view of Azechi et al. (US Pat. 5,691,407).

Kobayashi et al. teaches a curable composition comprising a curable component which is comprised of a polyfunctional siloxane and at least one crosslinker (abstract). Kobayashi et al. further teaches that the curable composition can be used for mold-release applications (5:63). It therefore follows that Kobayashi et al. teaches "a curable mold release composition" as stated in the claim preamble. Kobayashi et al. further teaches that the non-VOC carrier/diluent/solvent can be hexamethyldisiloxane and octamethylcyclotetrasiloxane (5:40-41). Kobayashi et al. further teaches that the carrier is present in amounts of up to 90 wt% (5:48). Kobayashi et al. does not explicitly teach the presence of a silazane coupling agent. However, Azechi et al. does teach the presence of a silazane coupling agent (4:30-49). Kobayashi et al. and Azechi et al. are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely, silicone rubber compositions. At the time of the invention, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to employ the silazane coupling agents as taught by Azechi et al. into the curable compositions as taught by Kobayashi et al. and would have been motivated to do so

Art Unit: 1796

because Azechi et al. teaches that both silazanes and aminosilanes are effective coupling agents (4:30-32). Kobayashi et al. explicitly teaches using aminosilane coupling agents (4:52-5:23). Based on the teaching of equivalency by Azechi et al., a person having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the silazane reagents as taught therein.

Claims 22 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobayashi et al. (US Pat. 5,880,227).

Kobayashi et al. teaches a method for preparing a curable mold release coating composition comprising: (a) providing a carrier composition/solvent and (b) mixing the carrier composition/solvent with a curable composition comprising at least one crosslinker and at least one polyfunctional siloxane (abstract and examples). Kobayashi et al. further teaches that the carrier composition/solvent comprises hexamethyldisiloxane and octamethylcyclotetrasiloxane (5:40-41).

Claims 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobayashi et al. (US Pat. 5,880,227).

Claim 24: Kobayashi et al. teaches a method for preparing a mold release coating comprising: (a) applying a carrier composition/solvent which may comprise hexamethyldisiloxane and octamethylcyclotetrasiloxane (5:40-41) and a curable component comprising a combination of at least one cross-linker and at least one polyfunctional siloxane (abstract) and allowing the composition to cure (examples).

Art Unit: 1796

Claim 25: While Kobayashi et al. is silent in regards to curing so as to achieve gloss values as claimed in instant claim 25, Kobayashi et al. does teach the same process and composition as claimed in instant claim 24. It therefore follows that the cured compositions would have the same properties as claimed because Kobayashi et al. teaches the same composition (*vide supra*).

Claims 1, 3, 6-11 and 14-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gantner et al. (US Pat. 6,512,072).

Claims 1, 3 and 6-11: Gantner et al. teaches a moisture-curable composition comprising a volatile non-reactive diluent/non-VOC carrier such as hexamethyldisiloxane, octamethylcyclotetrasiloxane, decamethylcyclopentasiloxane, and other short chain linear siloxanes (4:19-31) in amounts up to 94.99% (4:32-33), and a curable component based on a polyfunctional polysiloxane (2:4-3:33) and a crosslinking agent (4:39-65). While the end use of the compositions taught by Gantner et al. is geared towards coatings/films on biological membranes (7:7-13), Gantner et al. does teach that the compositions may also achieve properties related to release coatings (7:1-6). Therefore, it is the position of the Office that Gantner et al. teaches the same intended use as the instant application.

While Gantner et al. is silent with regards to mold release performance, specifically, as that the composition(s) are able to promote at least five mold releases without transfer of mold release composition to a part, Gantner et al. does teach the chemical composition of instant claim 1. The courts have stated that a chemical composition and its properties are inseparable.

Art Unit: 1796

Therefore, if the prior art teaches the identical chemical structure, the properties applicant discloses and/or claims are necessarily present. *In re Spada*, 911 F.2d 705, 15 USPQ2d 1655, (Fed. Cir. 1990). See also *In re Best*, 562 F.2d 1252, 195 USPQ 430, (CCPA 1977). "Where the claimed and prior art products are identical or substantially identical in structure or composition, or are produced by identical or substantially identical processes, a prima facie case of either anticipation or obviousness has been established." Further, if it is the applicant's position that this would not be the case: (1) evidence would need to be provided to support the applicant's position; and (2) it would be the Office's position that the application contains inadequate disclosure that there is no teaching as to how to obtain the claimed properties with only the claimed ingredients.

Claim 14: Gantner et al. further teaches that the cross-linking agent can be a trialkoxysilane (4:55-65).

Claim 15: Because Gantner et al. teaches some of the same non-VOC carrier/diluent/solvent as the instant application, it inherently follows that Gantner et al. teaches that the composition of instant claim 1 has a room temperature solvent evaporation range falling in the range of instant claim 15.

Claims 16 and 20: Gantner et al. further teaches that room temperature cures take place within 10 minutes, which falls into the range of instant claim 16.

Claim 17: Gantner et al. further teaches that the polyfunctional siloxane has viscosities of 0.5 to 3,000 Pa·s (500 to 3,000,000 mPa·s) (500 to 3,000,000 cps) at 25 °C/room temperature (2:27-29).

Claim 18: Gantner et al. further teaches additional components may be added (5:5-6:26).

Art Unit: 1796

Claim 19: Gantner et al. further teaches a moisture catalyst (3:55-65).

Claims 22 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gantner et al. (US Pat. 6,512,072).

Gantner et al. teaches a method for preparing a curable mold release coating composition comprising: (a) providing a carrier composition/diluent and (b) mixing the carrier composition/diluent with a curable composition comprising at least one crosslinker and at least one polyfunctional siloxane (abstract and examples). Gantner et al. further teaches that the carrier composition/diluent comprises hexamethyldisiloxane (examples).

Claims 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gantner et al. (US Pat. 6,512,072).

Claim 24: Gantner et al. teaches a method for preparing a mold release coating comprising: (a) applying a carrier composition/solvent which may comprise hexamethyldisiloxane (examples) and a curable component comprising a combination of at least one cross-linker and at least one polyfunctional siloxane (examples) and allowing the composition to cure (examples).

Claim 25: While Gantner et al. is silent in regards to curing so as to achieve gloss values as claimed in instant claim 25, Gantner et al. does teach the same process and composition as claimed in instant claim 24. It therefore follows that the cured compositions would have the same properties as claimed because Gantner et al. teaches the same composition (vide supra).

Art Unit: 1796

Claims 1-9 and 11-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horie et al. (JP-06-88025). For convenience, the English-language, machine-translation will be relied upon.

Claims 1 and 11: Horie et al. teaches a curable silicone coating material comprising, a non-volatile (non-VOC) organic carrier/diluent composition (abstract) and a curable component comprising a polyfunctional siloxane and a cross-linker (paragraphs 0020 and 0021). Horie et al. further teaches the use of these compositions imparting slip to a coated surface. It therefore follows that a person having ordinary skill in the art would understand that the compositions taught by Horie et al. would inherently serve as mold-release agents.

While Horie et al. is silent with regards to mold release performance, specifically, as that the composition(s) are able to promote at least five mold releases without transfer of mold release composition to a part, Horie et al. does teach the chemical composition of instant claim 1. The courts have stated that a chemical composition and its properties are inseparable. Therefore, if the prior art teaches the identical chemical structure, the properties applicant discloses and/or claims are necessarily present. *In re Spada*, 911 F.2d 705, 15 USPQ2d 1655, (Fed. Cir. 1990). See also *In re Best*, 562 F.2d 1252, 195 USPQ 430, (CCPA 1977). "Where the claimed and prior art products are identical or substantially identical in structure or composition, or are produced by identical or substantially identical processes, a prima facie case of either anticipation or obviousness has been established." Further, if it is the applicant's position that this would not be the case: (1) evidence would need to be provided to support the applicant's position; and (2) it

Art Unit: 1796

would be the Office's position that the application contains inadequate disclosure that there is no teaching as to how to obtain the claimed properties with only the claimed ingredients.

Claim 2: Horie et al. further teaches that additional volatile solvents can be added to the composition in addition to the non-VOC/diluent, therefore providing for a low-VOC carrier/diluent mixture (paragraph 0031).

Claim 3: Horie et al. further teaches that the compositions can be moisture-curable or addition curable (paragraph 0015).

Claims 4 and 5: While Horie et al. is silent with regards to gloss values of the composition, Horie et al. does teach the chemical composition of instant claim 1. The courts have stated that a chemical composition and its properties are inseparable. Therefore, if the prior art teaches the identical chemical structure, the properties applicant discloses and/or claims are necessarily present. *In re Spada*, 911 F.2d 705, 15 USPQ2d 1655, (Fed. Cir. 1990). See also *In re Best*, 562 F.2d 1252, 195 USPQ 430, (CCPA 1977). "Where the claimed and prior art products are identical or substantially identical in structure or composition, or are produced by identical or substantially identical processes, a prima facie case of either anticipation or obviousness has been established." If it is the applicant's position that this would not be the case: (1) evidence would need to be provided to support the applicant's position; and (2) it would be the Office's position that the application contains inadequate disclosure that there is no teaching as to how to obtain the claimed properties with only the claimed ingredients.

Claims 6-8: Horie et al. teaches that the non-VOC carrier/diluent comprises the linear and cyclic siloxanes of instant claims 6-8 (paragraphs 0009 and 0010).

Art Unit: 1796

Claim 9: Horie et al. further teaches that the non-VOC/diluent can be present at up to 80% by weight which falls into the range of instant claim 9 (paragraph 0014).

Claims 12 and 13: Horie et al. further teaches that the polyfunctional siloxane is a hydroxy-terminated polysiloxane having a molecular weight which falls into the range of instant claim 13 (paragraph 0020).

Claim 14: Horie et al. further teaches that the cross-linker is a silane having an alkoxy functional silane (paragraph 0021).

Claim 15: Horie et al. further teaches that solvents which have the limitation of instant claim 15 (paragraph 0031).

Claims 16 and 20: Horie et al. further teaches a room temperature cure of 24 hours (paragraph 0035).

Claim 17: Horie et al. further teaches that the polyfunctional siloxane has a viscosity range of 50-100,000 cSt, which partially encompasses the viscosity range of instant claim 17 (paragraph 0020).

Claims 18 and 19: While Horie et al. does not explicitly teach the presence of a catalyst which promotes moisture curing, Horie et al. does teach that moisture-curable compositions can be employed (paragraphs 0033-0034). Official Notice is given that it is well-known to include catalysts which promote moisture-curing in systems which cure by the moisture-curing mechanism(s).

Art Unit: 1796

Claims 22 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horie et al. (JP-06-88025). For convenience, the English-language, machine-translation will be relied upon.

Horie et al. teaches a method for preparing a curable mold release coating composition comprising: (a) providing a carrier composition/diluent and (b) mixing the carrier composition/diluent with a curable composition comprising at least one crosslinker and at least one polyfunctional siloxane (paragraphs 0033-0034). Horie et al. further teaches that the carrier composition/diluent comprises hexamethyldisiloxane (abstract).

Claims 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horie et al. (JP-06-88025). For convenience, the English-language, machine-translation will be relied upon.

Claim 24: Horie et al. teaches a method for preparing a mold release coating comprising: (a) applying a carrier composition/solvent which may comprise hexamethyldisiloxane (abstract) and a curable component comprising a combination of at least one cross-linker and at least one polyfunctional siloxane (examples 0033-0034) and allowing the composition to cure (paragraph 0035).

Claim 25: While Horie et al. is silent in regards to curing so as to achieve gloss values as claimed in instant claim 25, Horie et al. does teach the same process and composition as claimed in instant claim 24. It therefore follows that the cured compositions would have the same properties as claimed because Horie et al. teaches the same composition (vide supra).

Art Unit: 1796

Relevant Art Cited

The prior art made of record and not relied upon but is considered pertinent to applicants disclosure can be found on the attached PTO-892 form.

Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert Loewe whose telephone number is (571) 270-3298. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 9:30 AM to 7:00 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Eashoo can be reached on (571) 272-1197. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

RSL

11-Dec-07


MARK EASHOO, PH.D.
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

31/Dec/07